

Schary, Claire

From: Bresler, Helen (ECY) <HBRE461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2014 11:13 AM
To: Carrie Sanneman; Schary, Claire; Bobby Cochran; Joe Furia; Karin Power; Neil Mullane; Tim Wigington
Cc: mgil461@ECY.WA.GOV
Subject: RE: Revisions to Recommendations

Have looked this over. See my responses below. I think we're there.

From: Carrie Sanneman [mailto:sanneman@willamettepartnership.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:50 PM
To: Bresler, Helen (ECY); Schary, Claire; Bobby Cochran; Joe Furia; Karin Power; Neil Mullane; Tim Wigington
Subject: Revisions to Recommendations

Hi all,

We've kicked around your proposed changes. We are good with most of them, and have come up with the following feedback. All new changes are shown in **bright green highlight**. Let us know how you feel about these, and note that we will do a sweep for formatting and internal cross-references once the we are finished with the revision cycles.

Getting closer and closer! Thanks!
Carrie

- Removed "or mixing zone" from Section 1.2.2, #2 per Susan's comment

Helen OK

- Small omission to the direct quote that Helen added, leaving out reference to point source waste load allocation, as that is not the focus here and may be confusing.

Agree with Claire that we should not edit a direct quote.

- SC9 – Clarifying edit re: Claire's comment that it was confusing

Helen OK

- Added a couple "and/or" in – see paragraph w/SC9 and in FN called out by HB10

Helen OK

- FN 85 v. 91 consistency – see my edits to FN 91. I pulled out the TMDL LA, TMDL imp plan and settlement pieces b/c this FN is just talking about non-state baseline sources and the need to continue to comply with those other requirements.

Helen OK

- Section 2.1 intro, just added in “control” into “general nonpoint source control authority”

Helen OK

- SC16 – made stylistic edits to Claire’s changes

Helen OK

- SC19 – Revised the example that Claire's added to avoid confusion between baseline requirements and trading ratios.

Helen: I agree with Claire’s comment on this, still not clear, although I think Claire’s wording suggestion fixes it unless you actually meant something else.

- SC20 – Given that this is an example (starts with "In some trading contexts..."), we don't feel that this affects how a zero discharge scenario would play out. Suggest retaining existing text.

Helen: I can live with this for now, although I will say that if we do include this concept in the final document, it would also affect the discussion of base year, because that would not be used in the scenario I’m envisioning.